

THE
MORAL REFORMER.

No. 5.

MAY 1, 1833.

Vol. III.

THE SABBATH.

THE extent of the obligation for keeping a Sabbath, and the authority upon which it is founded, are now points of general discussion. The presentation of so many petitions, and the introduction of a bill into the House of Commons, have brought the subject more prominently before the public than it has been for many years. The whole seems to resolve itself into these two questions—What are our obligations in reference to a peculiar observance of Sunday? and, How far has the government a right to interfere? Very few, I fear, have clearly defined views as to these questions; standards, as various as the persons who propose them, are set up, and nothing is more common than for one man to condemn another as a Sabbath breaker for the commission of practices similar to which he allows in himself. Though I have no expectation of bringing over to my opinion many of those who take an opposite view, yet by giving a clear explanation of my own sentiments, those who hold the same opinion may have an opportunity of referring to a defined view of the question, and to an investigation of the arguments on the other side. I do not say that I have approached this examination without prepossession, but I think I can say, that whatever result the evidence might have led me to, I should have been equally satisfied; and especially to that mode of keeping the Sabbath which is likely to contribute the most to the spread of religion.

I believe we have no advocates for a full *seven* days labour in the week; all are willing to concede, either from revelation or the principle of utility, that *six* days are sufficient for labour; and therefore the question is, *how* the other day should be spent.

From both the Old and New Testament we learn that the Jews observed the seventh day as a Sabbath. This they did upon the authority of God, and by the orders of their great law giver, Moses; and the following passages will shew the strictness of their observance. “Remem-

ber the Sabbath day to keep it holy ; six days shalt thou labour and do *all* thy work, but the seventh is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God ; in it thou shalt *not* do *any* work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man servant, nor thy maid servant, nor thy cattle, nor the stranger that is within thy gates." "Bake that which ye will bake to-day, and seethe that which ye will seethe to-day ; to-morrow is the holy Sabbath unto the Lord." "Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore, for it is holy unto you : every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death : for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people." "Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations on the Sabbath day." A man was detected gathering sticks on the Sabbath day, and upon this case "the Lord said unto Moses, the man shall surely be put to death ; all the congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp. And all the congregation brought him without the camp, and stoned him with stones, and he died, as the Lord commanded Moses." Exodus xvi. 23. xx. 8. xxxi. 15. xxxv. 3. Numbers xv. 32. The extent to which they were allowed to travel was but about a mile, called "a Sabbath day's journey." Any operations, however, connected with the ceremonial service, were allowed. They circumcised the children, offered sacrifices, and attended to all the bodily services of the temple on this day.

So far as it regards the Jews, as a nation, the matter is quite plain. How does it stand as it respects the *Gentiles*, who have received the gospel, and are wishful to do the will of Christ ?

It is assumed by great numbers, and taught with confidence, as if it were incontrovertible, that *the day is changed*, that the first day, instead of the seventh, is the *Christian Sabbath*, and that the regulations found in the Jewish law are adopted, and rendered binding upon Christians. I differ from this opinion, and the following are my reasons.

1. *No Sabbath is ever enjoined upon Christians, either by Christ or his apostles.* There is not a word upon the subject in all the New Testament, either as a precept or an admonition. Is it possible that so great a change could be effected, a change likely to give so much offence to the Jews, without being even named in any of the writings of the New Testament ? *Sabbath breaking is never reproved in any part of the Christian revelation*, and the fair presumption is, that the ideas of the apostles upon *Sabbath obligations* were different from those which some would endeavour to cultivate at this day. If either the Jewish Sabbath was adopted, with a charge of the day, or a new *Sabbath* ordained, how are we to account for the absence of a single precept upon the subject ?

2. The Jews continued, while they remained a nation, to observe their own Sabbath. Christ never insinuated any thing derogatory to their Sabbath obligations, although he exposed some of their inconsistencies; he never relieved his own Jewish disciples from their duty in this respect; and after they became Christians, they continued to observe this as well as the other parts of the law of Moses. Various passages in the Acts of the Apostles shew, that the Jewish Sabbath was observed, that it was not changed to any other day, and it is evident, from Mat. xxiv. 20, that such an observance would continue till the destruction of Jerusalem. So strict were the Jews, that they would not do any kind of work to defend themselves in case of a siege, on the Sabbath day; to flee also on that day was considered wrong; and hence Jesus says, alluding to the siege of Jerusalem, "Pray that your flight be not in the winter, nor on the Sabbath day." Is it likely, then, that the Jewish Christians would observe *two* Sabbaths?

3. The *genius of the Christian religion* accounts for this total silence in reference to the subject of the Sabbath. It is not a religion merely of *times* and *places*. It has its seat in the understanding, is cherished by the affections, and is known to others, not by attending to times and seasons, to outward forms and ceremonies, but by the *uniform fruits of good living*. Here is the grand superiority of Christianity over Judaism: the piety of the one is to be excited by imposing ceremonies and a splendid priesthood, and its worship secured by external restraints, both as to the *day* and every other circumstance. The Jews were like children, and the law was their "school-master" until Christ came. "Meat and drink, holy days, new moons and Sabbath days," very appropriately belonged to a dispensation like the Jews. We are now instructed to worship God "in spirit and in truth," to pray always, and in every thing to give thanks. In a word, the religion of Christ is a *spiritual* religion; has no special connection with either days or places; it is an every-day and an every-place religion, and is intended not for Judea, but for the whole world. It is this view of the subject, especially, that emboldens me to oppose the popular opinion respecting the Sabbath. Excessive strictness on one day, generally leads to greater laxity on others; and though I know religious people do not design this, yet the termination of the Sabbath, like Lent, and the sacrament week, often leave the mind with an impression that something has been done which should serve for more than the day. It is in the heart, and not in the prayer book; in our private duties, our public usefulness, and our practical conformity to the precepts of Christianity, and not in a mere conformity to outward observance of days, that real religion consists.

4. If the Jewish Sabbath had been intended to be of *perpetual obligation*

tion upon the *Gentiles*, it must be so (except otherwise ordered by divine authority) not only as to the *day*, but as to the *duties* and the *penalties*. This brings the Sabbath advocates into a strange dilemma. They must have an holy convocation, and offer up sacrifices. They must not kindle a fire, nor cook any food. No servants, nor horse, nor any thing within their gates must work. And in cases of Sabbath breaking, the offender must be stoned with stones till he die. Is this what is meant when we have reiterated in our ears, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy?" Jewish precepts have been borrowed, but somebody greater than Moses has taken the liberty to *alter* their meaning. The injunction, in general terms, is quoted as it stands in the law; the explanations offered moderate its severity *a little*; and the practical commentary *a little more*. The fact is, we have had a floating standard as to keeping the Sabbath; a standard that has scarcely ever been recognized, beyond mere profession. I could enumerate a vast number of practices, evidently inconsistent with the law of Moses, which would have been deemed by him Sabbath breaking, but are now ranked very conveniently among the *works of necessity*: but I must not enlarge. But when we see a smoking hot dinner upon a minister's table; all the servants busily employed in waiting; a coach, pair of horses, and a coachman taking him to the chapel; when we hear at one place announced, that at the close of the service the pews will be let; at another, it is quarter day; when six or eight men are employed, in their shirt sleeves, disturbing the quiet of a whole town by ringing the bells; we are apt to ask, If Sabbath breakers are to be stoned to death, who is sufficiently innocent to throw the first stone? But this is merely *working*: when we proceed to *trading*, and find one man getting 18s. a Sunday for playing the organ; and the old man behind the scenes 6d. for blowing the bellows; the singers turned out for wages; the clerk £10 a year for responding to the prayers; a young dissenting student receiving a *guinea* for his Sunday's work; and ministers salaries from £100 to £500 a year for work, the principal part of which is done on Sundays,—when we go into the vestry of a parish church on a Sunday, and hear the money jingle on the table—10d. for churching, 13d. for funeral dues, 9d. for tolling, 3s. 6d. for publishing marriage bands, 2s. 10d. for wedding a couple, and a *guinea* for moving the grave stone; and see the parson, the clerk, and the poor sexton each take his quota,—when we know hundreds who (including a little time that the sermons may *some time* have cost) get from £2 to £20 a *Sunday for about four hours' service*,—when I consider these *facts*, my soul recoils at the sound of Sabbath breaking; they give an emphasis which I never felt before to the words, "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is *HYPOCRISY*." Never let ministers

and clergymen again approach the legislature with petitions against the desecration of the Sabbath ; and never let them promulgate a law of which their own practices afford the worst exposition. It is obvious, that, by referring to the Jewish law, our teachers bring the matter into confusion, and set up a standard to which neither they nor their fathers have adhered. The seventh day Sabbath was suited to the Jews, as a nation, under an external dispensation, and was of Jehovah's own appointment ; but to me it is evident, both from the nature of the case, and Christ's own silence upon the subject, that it was not suited nor intended for "all nations," out of which Christ's kingdom was to be formed.

Nothing, however, was more likely than that the Christians, whether Jews or Gentiles, would fix upon some convenient time at which to meet together. When we read that "they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine, in fellowship, in breaking of bread, and in prayers," although the leaders were "daily" engaged, the great body of disciples, it is probable, would fix upon some day on which they all might meet together. And whether it had its commencement from the circumstance of Christ's rising on "the first day of the week," or whether it was purely of apostolic injunction, we cannot tell ; but the fact is indisputable, that *this was the day on which the Christians met together*. We have intimations of this in John xx. 19, 26 ; but this does not mark the practice of the churches so decidedly as the following : "And upon the *first day of the week*, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them," &c. "Now, concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given orders to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye, upon the *first day of the week*." Acts xx. 7. 1st Cor. xvi. 1, 2. There are several circumstances, also, in the connection of these passages, which make it evident, that it was the *general* practice of the primitive Christians to hold their meetings on the first day of the week. But it is not intimated how often they met, whether more than once, or how they employed the day in any other respect. It has been surmised, that a number of those alluded to in Acts xx. 7. were slaves, and that this was the reason of their not meeting till evening. My opinion upon the whole, is, that the Christian Jews observed the seventh day Sabbath, the same as the rest of their nation, and that all the Christians, whether Jews or Gentiles, met on the first day, for the social services of Christianity ; and that this practice continued, and the day became more and more distinctly marked, as Christians became more numerous, till about fifty or sixty years after, when John was writing in the Isle of Patmos, the day had obtained the appellation of "the Lord's Day." Rev. i. 10, that is, a day observed in remembrance of the Lord—the Lord Jesus.

God has spoken to us in these latter days by his Son ; to his teaching, miracles, death, resurrection, and universal dominion, we owe all our hopes of immortality ; and nothing can be more important, even independent of any appointment, than that Christians should meet together to strengthen each other's faith, record their gratitude to their Lord and Saviour, and to diffuse the joys and blessings of the gospel. And when they find that the *first day of the week* is the season especially fixed upon by their primitive brethren, their course of duty, *so far*, seems clearly marked out. As to the observance of the day *in other respects*, as we have no direct law upon the subject, we must be guided by circumstances. Persons may be so situated as to be obliged to work on a Sunday ; but I think it may be fairly remarked, that *where persons have any choice, and prefer either labour or worldly pleasures to pursuits tending to the religious improvement of themselves and others, and to the honour of Christ*, they are not acting in the character of a Christian.

Though I dispute the right of the civil authorities to order any thing connected with the religion of Jesus, yet it is quite within their province to make such regulations, as to the conducting of business, and the arrangements of time, throughout the country, as will clearly tend to the public good. And in a country like this, which happens to be Christian in profession, a government is acting in its true character to secure to the people that day which their religion leads them to respect. It would be equally consistent, if the nation were Jews, to encourage the cessation from labour on a Saturday. It is the duty of a government to secure to all religionists every civil enjoyment, and never to interfere with conscience. And, therefore, as to the present question before the House of Commons, it is right for the government to suppress *Sunday trading*, in order to secure to every family the privileges of the day, and also to put down *all practices offensive to civil society*, such, for instance, as often connect with public houses. But to *compel* people to go to a place of worship, or otherwise to interfere with the liberty of the people, as to their pursuits and the way they employ their time, would be improper, and productive of hypocrisy.

To the views developed in this paper, as to the *exclusiveness* of the Jewish Sabbath, *three* objections may be raised. To these I shall offer such answers as satisfy my own mind.

Objection 1. If God sanctified, or set apart the Sabbath at the creation, as it appears from Gen. ii. 3, it can have no peculiar reference to the Jews.—Answer. Because the *mention* of the Sabbath occurs here, it does not follow that God instituted it immediately after the creation. This history, it must be remembered, was written by Moses, and probably about

the time that the Sabbath was instituted among the children of Israel; and in giving the history of the creation, nothing was more likely than that he should mention here, for the advantage of the Israelites, the reason why God had sanctified the seventh day, namely, because he rested from the works of creation. What gives greater probability to this view is, that from the creation to the marching of the children of Israel in the wilderness, a period of about 2,500 years, there is no mention of the observance of a Sabbath. I fully admit, that if it could be proved that the Sabbath was instituted in Adam's time, as some would suppose from this passage, this would be stronger evidence of the universal obligation for keeping the seventh day, than all the other reasons usually assigned put together.

Objection 2. But is not the *reason* assigned for the Sabbath, namely, "because God rested on the seventh day, from the works of the creation," one which ought to influence all mankind?—Answer. If there be any religious reason for Christians observing a day, besides those referred to in the practices of the first churches, I certainly know of none more important than the one here assigned. But though we admit of this, like many other general motives for piety, we must not enforce that as a law upon others which cannot be clearly proved to be of divine authority. These injunctions are given directly to the *Jews*, are mixed up with their peculiar observances: they had Sabbaths of weeks and Sabbaths of years. But, what is more conclusive always in my mind, we never find either Jesus or his apostles enjoining any sabbatical observance, or referring to the matter in any way from which it can be gathered that the Gentiles were to come under this law.

Objection 3. "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy; six days shalt thou labour, but the seventh is the Sabbath," is one of the ten commandments, and is of universal obligation.—Answer. The latter part of this objection assumes what ought to be proved. Nothing is said in the New Testament of the "ten commandments," and we never find them adopted by the apostles as a standing summary of duty for the Christian churches. Every *moral* duty enjoined under any dispensation must remain binding under any other dispensation, and as such the prohibition of murder, theft, uncleanness, and the duties to parents, &c. are frequently referred to and enjoined by the apostles, but never as forming a *part* of a decalogue which was universally binding. The moral, ceremonial, and political injunctions constituted altogether "the law of Moses;" and if there be one thing clearer than another it is this, that the Gentile converts were neither required to be circumcised nor to keep the law. Though we have

two tables of commandments hanging in every church, including the injunction respecting the Sabbath (a standing condemnation of the secular traffic carried on in the place) we never find them adopted by the apostles in this *Mosaic* character. And when we find the decalogue prefaced with "I am the Lord thy God which brought thee *out of the land of Egypt*, out of the house of bondage"—speaking of visiting the iniquity of the fathers *upon the children* to the third and fourth generation—*living long in the land of Canaan*, as a motive of obedience to parents,—it will be seen, whatever use it might be made of after, the decalogue was intended for the children of Israel. Besides, it is the *seventh* day which the commandment enjoins, and not the *first*, which is now affected to be kept.

My conclusion from the whole is, that, as Gentile Christians, we are not under the Jewish law, and consequently not obliged to keep the Jewish Sabbath. But situated as we are in this country, it is a great privilege, in the first place, to have an ordinance of the state which secures to us the first day of the week from the toils of labour and business, and we ought scrupulously to respect this law. In the second place, we should regard this as "the Lord's day," and employ it in a way calculated to do honour to his name, and spread the blessings of his gospel around us. Beyond the fact of the first Christians meeting together, we have nothing but *general principles*, and when the heart is right, these will be sufficient; when it is not, the most minute details will produce little but hypocrisy.

CORPORATIONS.

A commission being appointed to inquire into the state of the corporations, it becomes those, especially in our old boroughs, who are degraded as *bondmen*, to be alive to the subject, and to lay before the commission the various hardships of which they have to complain. Why should an arbitrary distinction be kept up in society of *free-men* and *bond-men*? And why should one party be allowed to impose taxes upon the other, without either offering an equivalent, or rendering any account of the expenditure? Why should we be so unmerciful as to render many of our neighbours useless, and frequently to destroy their lives, by supplying the means of surfeiting and excess? The borough corporations, like the church, are ever more at variance with the people, and instead of estimating themselves by their *usefulness*, and collecting money by the *same rule*, they stand upon prescriptive privileges, and have collected immense sums to which in justice they have no claim. I am glad an investigation is taking place. I hope a petition will be sent from Preston, and from every other corrupt borough.

HUNTING.

How grovelling are some men's pursuits! how strange are they to a course of philanthropic labour! Sensual enjoyments and brutalizing pleasures are all they live for, and to these they devote their time and their fortunes. *Hunting* is really a most uncivilized employment; it is barbarous and cruel; and yet we find even the black coats as well as the red ones joining in the chase. One morning, I met a number of grey-hounds belonging to a magistrate near Bolton, well covered with *good clothing*, in the care of the keeper. Ah! thought I, would that the owners of these were as anxious to clothe the poor, and to maintain a person to watch over them! The following will shew the extent to which this practice is carried, and the expence attending it, in some parts of Leicestershire.

Melton Mowbray, a small town in Leicestershire, generally contains from two to three hundred hunters, in the hands of the most experienced grooms England can produce, the average number being ten to each sportsman residing there, although some of those who ride heavy, and rejoice in long purses, have from fourteen to twenty for their own use. The stud of the Earl of Plymouth has, for many years, exceeded the last mentioned number. It may seem strange that one man should, under any circumstances, need so large a number of horses solely for his own personal use in the field; and it must be admitted that few countries do require it. In Leicestershire, however, the universal practice is, for each sportsman to have at least two hunters in the field on the same day—a practice proved to be economical, as it is from exhaustion, the effect of long continued severe work, that the health of horses is most injured. And when it is considered that a horse should always have five days' rest after a moderate, and at least seven or eight after a severe run with hounds, it will not seem surprising that ten or twelve hunters should be deemed an indispensable stud for a regular Leicestershire sportsman. The sum total of expenses attending a stud of twelve hunters at Melton, including every outgoing, is, as nearly as can be estimated, 1000*l.* per annum.

 BEAUTIES OF THE CHURCH.

The following I have received from a friend at Reading, taken from a Carlisle paper.

A proceeding at Cockermonth marks strongly the present state of the church in what we may call that region. The chaplain to the gaol at Carlisle has a salary of 125*l.* per annum. This no one can think too much, if the duties be properly performed by the rev. gentleman, a Mr. Wilkinson; but Sir W. Lawson drew the attention of the magistrates to the fact, that Mr. Wilkinson was not only chaplain to the gaol, but lecturer at St. Mary's and St. Cuthbert's, chaplain to the forces at Carlisle, and also kept a school. He had, and still has, in truth, has many occupations as the servant of Elwes, the miser, who, besides being huntsman and whipper-in, milked the cows, cleaned his own and his master's shoes, and waited at table. We may say, this is no disparagement of Mr. Wilkinson: his accumulated toil may be necessary, for anything we know, for the support of a large family. But in the

same city of Carlisle there is a Dean, whose name, we see, occurs in the proceedings—Dr. Hodgson—who, besides being Dean of Carlisle, has also a good living somewhere in the north of England; and, besides that living and that deanery in the north of England, has also in London the valuable rectory of St. George's, Hanover-square; and, besides this valuable rectory, has also another living in the south, on the southernmost verge of the county of Middlesex, with a chapelry or something else annexed in the town of Uxbridge. Now, Mr. Wilkinson's education has probably been the same as Mr. Hodgson's; his energy and talent obviously greater. Is such a distribution of church property, we ask, tolerable? We put the question to the Archbishop of Canterbury, to the Bishop of London, from whom his country expects so much, to the warmest friends of the church. Is such an accumulation of preferment upon one man tolerable, whilst others are starving? On the score, however, of the most singular man, Dr. Hodgson, with four valuable pieces of preferment in four different parts of the kingdom, we ask, Where is he now? We advertise him. He is not at St. George's, Hanover-square; he is not at Hillington, on the remotest borders of Middlesex, towards Buckinghamshire. Is he in Cumberland, at the place upon the sands? Would he were stranded there! It is such men as he that have nearly stranded the Church of England. Or is he at the Deanery of Carlisle? How many licences for non-residence has he? Who has signed them? and on what pretext? Small as is the see of Carlisle, it affords some admirable specimens of the working of the church system, and of these we will now give a sample. And first of the pluralists we have

Hugh Percy, Bishop of Carlisle, a Prebend of St. Paul's, and a Chancellor of Sarum.

R. Hodgson, Dean of Carlisle, Vicar of Burgh-on-Sands, Rector of St. George's, Hanover square, and Vicar of Hillington.

E. Goodenough, Prebend of Carlisle, Westminster, and York, Vicar of Wath All Saints on Dearn, Chaplain of Adwick, and Chaplain of Brampton Bierlow.

S. J. Goodenough, Prebend of Carlisle, Rector of Broughton Poges, Vicar of Hampton, and deputy Lord-Lieutenant of Cumberland.

Wm. Goodenough, Archdeacon of Carlisle, Rector of Marcham-le-Fen, and Rector of Great Salkeld.

W. Vausittart, D. D., Prebend of Carlisle, Master of Wigston's Hospital, Leicester, Vicar of Waltham Abbas, and Vicar of Shottesbrooke.

W. Fletcher, Chancellor of the Diocese of Carlisle, Prebend of York, Vicar of Bromfield, Vicar of Dalston, and Vicar of Lazenby.

There are other pluralists connected with us, but these are the principal "birds of prey" who at this moment present themselves to our remembrance. They are a goodly company, and if riches be truly the bar to heaven, their chance of passing the needle's eye is certainly as small as that of the camel, spoken of in a certain book they profess to teach, but the precepts of which, on the score of money, they appear not over ambitious of following.

It is not our intention, at present, to inquire into the incomes of these dignitaries; but as they are pretty considerable, it may be worth while just to contrast the salaries they award to those who really work with the monies they receive from the livings. The tithes received by the Dean and Chapter for Hesket amount to 1,000*l.* or 1,500*l.* a-year; they pay the curate who does the duty 18*l.* 5*s.* a-year!—that is to say, 1*s.* a-day—being after the rate of a bricklayer's labourer's wages! In Wetheral, and Warwick, the Dean and Chapter draw about 1000*l.* a-year from tithes, and 1,000*l.* a-year from the church lands; and they pay

the working minister (probably one of the most exemplary and beloved men in England in his station) the sum of 50*l.* a-year—the wages of a journeyman cabinet maker! The tithes of the parishes of St. Cuthbert and St. Mary amount, at the least, to 1,500*l.* a-year. The two curates (who do the duty) receive each the sum of 2*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.* a-year!!! And then, to the minor canons, who do the cathedral duty (such as it is) they pay the sum of 6*s.* 8*d.* a-year each! The Dean and Chapter hold several other inappropriate rectories, pay the curates a mere nominal sum for performing the duties, and pocket the tithes themselves, for doing nothing!

The Dean and Chapter, in making these payments to the working clergy, are doubtless actuated by the very best of motives. They do not care to swell their own persons out with riches beyond the required bulk for the needle's eye, but they show a strong determination not to allow their servants to run equal risks by over-feeding. This is all very proper, were the public not called upon to make up for the scanty allowance by contributions from the taxes; but the under-paid apply for remuneration to a fund called Queen Anne's Bounty, which, like all other monarchical bounties, is a fund taken partly out of taxes raised from the people, and partly from the first-fruits, which used to go in diminution of the civil list.

What a horrid picture does the national church present! Professing itself to be established to promote religion and virtue, it is now wallowing in the spoils of ages of avarice and oppression, and is sowing extensively the seeds of infidelity and disgust. Need we wonder that crime should increase, while the object of those who should spread virtue among the people, both by precept and example, is not to feed, but to *devour* the flock? There is no business or profession among us, religion out of the question, that exhibits any thing equal to the avarice and audacity of some of the clergy. Depending for their appointments upon friends and relatives, they are not amenable—(I had nearly said, to those they *serve*, but some of them do *no service*)—to any body; and as for any sense of shame, their natures seem incapable of feeling it. Contrary to all justice, and destructive of ancient charity, they have secured to themselves a law of prescriptive right, that where a tithe, for instance, has been paid, it shall continue to be paid, although the amount is ten times what it was at first; although many articles are made titheable which never paid before; although the services originally intended to be performed are discontinued; and although the appropriation, being *now* to the parson exclusively, is entirely at variance with the original bequests. Tyranny, oppression, injustice, and inhumanity are written upon the front of the temporal part of the Church of England. And I cannot conceive any thing more desirable to a minister of the church, who really wishes to be useful as a Christian minister, or to the members themselves, who are anxious for the spread of pure and undefiled religion, than that *the church should be unfettered from*

the state—that every congregation should be allowed to choose its own minister, and to give him such a remuneration as is satisfactory to both parties. Was ever any thing more monstrous than this, that the farmer is not allowed a single voice in the choice of the minister, whom he supports by his labour and toil? A man comes into the parish as the minister, not because the parties choose him, nor because he is anxious to make himself useful as a pastor, but because he has got the *living*, perhaps purchased by a friend to avoid the charge of simony, and however unfit for the duties of a clergyman, and however disliked by the parishioners, there he remains in spite of them. Though he be at war with his parishioners, and though his conduct is any thing but calculated to promote religion and unity, or even though they should not see him twice a year, yet they have no power of redress, and must still contribute every year for his support, a tenth part of their industry! If the parishioners of St. Michaels or Kirkham were asked, Are you satisfied with your spiritual pastor, or should you like a change in the system? we need not wait for an answer—that has been given a thousand times in the murmurs of many, in the curses of others, against those whom, if real religion had any connection with the affair, they would esteem and respect. In our parish, I consider that the Vicar forces himself upon the people; they never chose him; they never requested him to come among them; and it is well known that very few, even of those who are church people, are upon friendly terms with him. If the question was put to the vote, and every one was *honest* enough to speak according to his feelings, whether we should have the present Vicar, or another really useful man of our own choosing, I do believe, out of nearly forty thousand parishioners, we should not have four hundred, including all the interested ones, that would not decidedly call for a change. If it be a hardship to have no voice in electing our representatives, is it less so to have no voice in choosing our religious teachers, whom we are compelled to pay? We are not more dissatisfied in Preston than many other places, and I merely place the subject in this light to shew, that, in the present state of public opinion, the system cannot be tolerated much longer. Instead of advocating an *entire separation of church and state*, uniting ministers and people by the *ties of religion* only, and making a man's hire dependant *upon his labour*, many church reformers are attempting to perpetuate the present system by taking away a few of its more shameful parts. This is a delusion, and the country should beware of being taken by it. Let all the people adopt their own creeds, pay their own teachers, and support the expences of their own

worship, and let all the tithes and church property be appropriated to national purposes, and then on this subject we shall be at peace. Ministers and people would live on amicable terms, the jarrings of sects would cease, and the untaught part of the population would be much better instructed than they ever will be under the present system.

A FUNERAL ADMONITION.*

My dear friends,

You are collected here to perform the last earthly service to one of your fellow creatures. Perhaps you have frequently attended on such occasions, and the time may not be far distant when your friends shall have to render the same service to you. It is appointed for all men once to die; and no other occasion is so much calculated to impress upon our minds man's frailty, mortality, and unworthiness, as that of a funeral. But it is lamentable to think that such an impression is seldom produced, and that your discourse, instead of being serious and edifying, is trifling, unprofitable, and pernicious. The principal cause of this is *the use of intoxicating liquors*. Why is it, that, at a funeral, you cannot even enter the door without being met with a tankard of inebriating liquor? When you get seated, the table is filled with glasses; and ale, hot and cold, is being handed round during the whole time you remain in the house. It is really astonishing that, on this solemn occasion, you should encourage, or even *permit*, a course of drinking exceeding that of any other occasion. Some get intoxicated before they leave the house, and are not able to walk steadily as they follow the corpse. And after committing the departed to the silent tomb, and listening to the affecting lessons pronounced at the grave, how often are the attendants requested to return, and tempted to spend the remainder of the day in excess! Oh! my friends! is this the way you choose to improve the solemn season of death? God here warns you to repent; but by conforming to the diabolical fashion of drinking at funerals, you scoff at the warning, and set the seal of disgrace and impenitence upon yourselves. To the friends of the deceased I would say—If a little refreshment be thought necessary for your guests, let it be such as cannot possibly do any harm; but *never* disgrace your house, nor the memory of your departed friend, by *giving a drop of intoxicating liquor*. To those who are invited to the funeral I also say—If the contents of the delusive glass or the maddening bowl be presented to you, *never taste*;

* This and the following are intended to be printed in hand bills for distribution.

bear your testimony against funeral drinking, and try to rescue yourselves and your acquaintance from this awful practice of intemperance.

A FRIEND.

YOU HAVE BEEN IN THE DRAM SHOP.

My dear friend,

I take this opportunity of giving you an admonition respecting your habit of calling at the dram shop. There was a time when you could pass every public house and every dram shop without any desire of stepping in; you had then no desire for rum or gin; at that time your health was better and your mind happier than ever they have been since; and you had your money in your pocket, to apply to useful purposes. What made you commence the practice of dram drinking? Why is it that you cannot pass the door without a squib? Why should you give way to a habit that you know has led, in hundreds of instances, to poverty, disgrace, and ruin? Because the liquor fires your mouth, and stimulates your feelings, are you so deluded as to think it does you good? It may warm you at the moment, by stimulating your blood, but afterwards you are much colder than you were before. We are assured, upon the highest medical authority, that all the spirit in the world *does not contain one particle of nourishment*; but not until lately have our females appeared so deluded as to drink these "fire waters" as nourishment. Just compare those who are dram drinkers with others, and you will find how much healthier and happier they are who never go near these places of destruction. I see that the practice is gaining upon you, and by-and-by you will be so under its influence as not to be able to do without it. Consider the amount of money you spend in this way, how disgraceful it is for a female thus to debase her character, and also the injury you are doing to others by your bad example. If a woman indulge in drinking, every thing will be going wrong at home, and instead of making the most of your earnings, it is likely you are in debt on every hand. And if you are young, and no housekeeper, depend upon it, you are cultivating a practice which will unfit you for being either a good wife or a good mother. Do take the advice of a friend, and *never again call at a dram shop*. If you are not ruined already, you are in the way for it, and nothing can prevent it but abstaining entirely from this health, life, and soul-destroying liquor. May God bless you, and help you to flee from gin and rum as your greatest enemies!

A FRIEND.

JUVENILE OFFENDERS.

The offenders of the above class have become so numerous, that one half, at least, are under twenty-one years of age. To mitigate the evil of so many young persons committed for trial lying in prison, by which their morals become more corrupted, a bill is before the House of Commons to give the magistrates the power of dealing with them in a summary way. Of the bill itself I say nothing; but the discussion which it produced calls for remark. The members all declared the subject was beset with difficulties, and while they all seemed full of invention how to punish, it seemed never to occur to a single individual, that the only rational, the only humane proposition would have been one to prevent these youths from becoming criminals, and thus rendering punishment unnecessary. Boys are not thieves from any fatuity, but from the vicious examples and circumstances with which they are surrounded, and from the absence of a suitable correcting influence. Instead of inventing new and more lenient methods of punishments, why not appoint a commission to examine the various causes, direct and indirect, which lead to juvenile delinquency, and then try to *remove those causes*. Generally speaking, the vices of youth, will be traceable to the character and neglect of the parents—these to the want of suitable and seasonable religious and moral instruction—and this want to the inefficiency and inattention of religious teachers. I will undertake to affirm, that where the people are well taught, where the religious teachers spend their time in going among the people, and diffusing, every day and in every place, the principles and precepts of Christianity, youthful delinquency, like that referred to in the bill, will scarcely be known. And I am astonished that members of parliament should never think of recommending a moral influence in preference to legal coercion, and that they should seem to forget—however ill it may have answered its proper end—that we have a national establishment intended and supported for this purpose. Not one member of parliament, during this discussion ever raised the question, *Why* is it that we have so many juvenile offenders whilst the nation is studded with churches and chapels, and whilst so much is said, and so much pretended to be done in the way of providing for the spiritual wants of the people? The fact is, our religious systems are antiquated and *unsuited to the state of our present population*. Let these gentlemen go with me on a Sunday forenoon into the working streets of Preston, and they will soon learn, that instead of keeping a clergy to teach the *people*, the people are *untaught*, and left and lost like sheep without a shepherd. We may change the mode of punishment as oft as we please, but among so immense a number of untaught

heathens (for in many of our towns they are little better) there will continue to be an ample supply of juvenile offenders.

STATE OF BOLTON.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MORAL REFORMER.

Dear Sir,—In looking over some of your former numbers, and especially the one containing your essay on the "Prevalency of vice, and its real cause," I have been induced to make calculations, and compare your statements with things as they really are. Society is more degraded, as to God, their own souls, and a future state, than any one can believe, unless he will take the trouble to examine for himself.

In the parish of Bolton alone, there are seventy-five thousand souls, and yet there are not seats, in all the places of worship put together, for more than seven thousand; and from these we may fairly deduct one-third as unoccupied; so that *seventy thousand souls in one parish alone do not attend the means of grace.* And such are the systems of the present day, that this great number of wandering sheep are suffered to stray without an effort to seek them out by the ministers of Christ. We also know, that all these who are come to years of maturity can as mechanically go to places of worship on a Sabbath morning as they can go to the factories on Monday morning, and herein some people, who hold strenuously some peculiar doctrines of the gospel, rest satisfied that it is the will or permission of God that it should be so. Those who absent themselves are certainly guilty, but the ministers of religion are not the less guilty on this account, as saith the Scriptures, "Go into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in, that my house may be filled."

After having signed a petition a few Sundays ago for the better observance of the Sabbath, I ascertained that people were working at the very time in the same person's factory who was to present it to the House of Commons, and that most of our founderies, factories and crofts allow of work being done on the Sabbath day. Here, again, have we not a claim upon our vicars, curates, and all other ministers of the gospel, as accredited persons, as persons who have professed to be moved by the Holy Ghost to all holy conduct in putting down vice, and to the "maintenance of true religion and virtue?" In reverting to the vast numbers who neglect public worship, viz. seventy thousand in one parish, allow me to ask a question, which may startle some of your readers, but it is one upon a subject which my father thought questionable when I was a boy—What good (at all adequate to the money spent and the time employed) have Sunday schools done? Some good must be allowed; but in proportion to the means made use of, no more than that of a mite to a mountain. Six days spent in the midst of a population of seventy thousand, who go no where, undoes nearly all that can be done by teachers in one day. Some churches and chapels can count a part of their congregation as having been Sunday school scholars, but the proof is to compare them with the population. The more we think upon the subject, the more we must be convinced that we are at the wrong end of the business of reforming and Christianizing the great mass of the people. If ministers, aided by the money and influence of their friends, would but go about, endeavouring to make the *parents good*, then we might hope, with as much reason as we look for good fruit from a good tree, that the *children would be good also*; and until they will do something like what is described in your sketch of John Fearless, I consider the case hopeless.

J. R.

MECHANICS' INSTITUTIONS.

Although the utility of these Institutions is so obvious and so generally acknowledged, I am sorry to find that in many places they are but badly supported. Intemperance with many, indifference with others, and prejudice with not a few, lead persons either to neglect or to oppose them. The following extracts from a pamphlet just published entitled, "A Lecture, delivered on the 14th and 22nd of January, 1833, on the opening of the Sheffield Mechanics' Institution, by the Rev. Thomas Allin," will be found seasonable and worthy of a perusal. He justly observes in the preface, "Not only are some of the grossest mistakes entertained on this subject, in some quarters, and a dishonourable indifference manifested towards it in others; but, as a principal cause of all this, seldom do Christian ministers attempt to place in a sufficiently prominent and impressive light, the ample support furnished by Divine Revelation to the great cause of knowledge and mental culture."

I select the principal part of Mr. Allin's argument in favour of the proposition, that "CHRISTIANITY NOT ONLY ALLOWS BUT REQUIRES THE ACQUISITION OF GENERAL KNOWLEDGE. In order to a due appreciation of some of the proofs of this proposition, it must be observed, that Christianity distinctly recognizes the divine and permanent authority of those doctrines and laws recorded in the Old Testament, which have reference to the common nature and state of man, as distinguished from things arising out of local circumstances, or things typical and ceremonial, and therefore temporary; as well as those additional doctrines and laws recorded in the New Testament. Now, with this fact in mind, let it be observed, that, according to this record of our faith, when the first human pair came forth from their Creator's hand innocent and happy, the following announcement conveyed to them the charter of their privileges, and the rule of their conduct, respecting the world in which they were placed, and the various orders of beings by which they were surrounded: 'Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fishes of the sea, and over the fowls of the air, and over the cattle and the wild beasts, and over every reptile that creepeth upon the earth.'* According to this divine annunciation, the earth was made and peopled, not that it might be shared by man in common with its other inhabitants, but that he might replenish, or fill it, and subdue, or bring it under his dominion. He is here placed on the same pre-eminence in authority as in capabilities; and the universal sway, for which his superior powers of reason are fitted, he is commanded to acquire: that is to say, as his well-being is the immediate end of this part of the creation, so to render it subservient to this end, is at once his duty and his privilege. But in order to do this, he must acquaint himself with the constitution and laws of nature—its adaptations and capabilities. He must understand the qualities of things, and the several purposes to which they are applicable: he must, in fact, explore the immense regions, which, in earth, and air, and sea, are placed before him, in order that all their contents, with all their capabilities, may be rendered subservient to his will, and promotive of his happiness. Such is the knowledge obviously necessary to universal appropriation and government. The same law, therefore, that directs to the end, authorizes the means; and by rendering such knowledge necessary to the attainment of that end, it not only allows, but requires the human race to secure it.

* Boethroyd's Translation.

"For the sake of some, it may be expedient to remark, that whatever change may have taken place in the situation or capabilities of man, since the first issuing forth of the divine decree, yet so far from this charter of human privileges having been repealed, it was expressly renewed to Noah and his sons, immediately after the flood. It therefore stands the charter of our privileges, and the law of our common nature. Capabilities may have lessened, or difficulties may have multiplied; but whatever capabilities remain, are to be exerted; and whatever difficulties are surmountable, are to be encountered. The way may have become more thorny, but it is to be trod; and the hill of knowledge may present a more steep and rugged ascent, but still the highest elevation possible is to be gained. This is the proud pre-eminence to which the God of Revelation points, and which, in language recognized by Christianity as obligatory and divine, he requires us to labour to attain."

After a reference to various passages in the Proverbs, and other parts of the Old Testament, he reasons as follows. "Now, as it surely will not be contended that it was by the knowledge of theology or morals exclusively that the heavens were first stretched out and the foundations of the earth laid, or by which the deeps are now regulated, and the clouds caused to shed down their refreshing contents upon the earth, so neither is it to this knowledge exclusively that the preceding eulogistic representation refers, but rather to that general knowledge of nature in its constitution, as well as in its physical and moral relations, which results from extensive research and high intellectual culture. This allowed, let it be particularly remarked, that such culture and research, and the knowledge resulting from them, are thus recommended, not to some peculiarly favoured classes of the community alone, the noble or the rich—nor to some particular country or age—but to man, *as man*—a being possessing powers suited to such exercises and acquirements, and capable of deriving from them temporal advantages and intellectual pleasures. These passages, then, embody those universal principles and rules of action which Christianity recognizes, and the truth and obligation of which it supposes and confirms. By what unheard-of principles of interpretation, or by what strange process of reasoning, passages like these are to be transformed into prohibitions of general knowledge, except to a highly favoured few, who may thereby acquire additional dignity to their rank, additional power over their fellows, or an augmentation of their riches, is not easy to conceive. Nor is it much more easy to understand how they are to be wrested into an *approval* of general ignorance. What! does Christianity intend to teach the mechanics' of Sheffield, and the labouring classes of the community at large, that they are not to aspire after the acquirement of any other knowledge except religion and their particular occupation, by eulogizing the wisdom that dwells with prudence, and finds out the knowledge of every invention; by which, too, a house is builded, and the chambers filled with riches; by which successful war is made, and order restored to the body politic after rebellion had involved it in confusion? Does Christianity command ignorance of *nature* and her laws, by pronouncing the man happy who finds that wisdom by which Jehovah founded the earth and established the heavens, and that knowledge by which he regulated the deep, and causes the clouds to drop down the dew? If this be the divine appointment of ignorance, how may we expect the attainment of knowledge to be commanded? Or, if this be an *approval* of ignorance, in what terms may we expect its sentence of condemnation to be pronounced?

"Let the mechanics of Sheffield, then, know—let the inhabitants of Christendom and

the world know—that Christianity, as it is contained in the Bible, takes not from man the key of knowledge. It lays him under no other interdict than this—that *the greater be not sacrificed to the less*. It does not, demon-like, present the material and moral world as a temple into which mortals are not permitted to look; through the doors of which it would be profanity to enter, and the treasures of which it would be sacrilege to appropriate; but, as the messenger of light and peace, Christianity throws open wide the doors of the wondrous structure which is raised for the glory of its Maker and the benefit of man, and authorizes and invites him to acquaint himself as fully as possible, both with every part of the edifice itself, and the inexhaustible treasures it contains; that, by understanding the structure and uses of the whole, he may admire and share the wisdom that formed it, and by the proper appropriation of the means of happiness thus supplied, he may the more fully enjoy, and the more widely dispense, the inexhaustible bounty of nature's God. Christianity, instead of forging chains for man, riveting them on his neck, and confining him to an aperture through which he may see only a few objects, say they are of the most splendid character, as the sun gilding the horizon with his morning beams, or emblazoning the firmament with his mid-day splendour, or the moon and stars shedding their mildest radiance by night—breaks off the fetters with which ignorance, and superstition, and the folly of legislation, have shackled him; throws open the doors of his prison-house, proclaims him to be a free-born son of God, and a subject of his universal government; brings him out into the broad light of day; presents before him not only a transporting heaven, but a wondrous earth; and commands him, by the most vigorous exercise of his intellectual powers, to traverse the vast domain which his heavenly Father has thus placed under his eye—to render it subservient to his interests, and promotive of the happiness of himself and his fellows—and thus to rise to the pre-eminence for which, even in the present world, the God of nature has designed him.

“Christianity thus presents before us the *plainest*, as well as the most *extensive*, charter of intellectual and moral immunities. It commands us to free the mind from ignorance, as well as to purge the heart from sin. So far from encouraging barrenness of mind and brutality of manners—frowning on the refinements of civilized life—and stinting both body and spirit to the scantiest measure of present enjoyment, it stands forward as the guardian angel of knowledge and happiness. And instead of condemning the wisdom by which the power of man is increased, and his empire enlarged; his manners refined, and his condition ameliorated; and to which are owing useful contrivances, good government, and salutary laws—it directs him at once to the immense treasures of nature and grace; and offers to his acceptance every thing that can give activity to the mind, or dignity to the character; peace to the conscience, or virtuous joy to the heart. This being the case, a Christian ought to be the most enlightened individual, in proportion to his circumstances and opportunities; and the readiest supporter of every institution, calculated either to enlarge the views of his fellow men, or to increase their means of usefulness, or of innocent enjoyment. The Christian, therefore, however sincere, who stands forward as the foe of knowledge, or the advocate of ignorance, widely mistakes the character of his religion, the nature of his own duties, and the ultimate effect of the work in which he is engaged. And though he is not, as his enemies and the enemies of his faith would represent, a demon of darkness, clothed as an angel of light, yet he unquestionably dishonours the religion he professes, by throwing over its lovely and attracting form the disfiguring and repelling mantle of the father of lies.

"Hitherto, however, we have confined ourselves to principles drawn from that economy by which Christianity, strictly so called, was preceded and introduced. Though, therefore, the conclusions at which we have already arrived might be deemed satisfactory, yet, for reasons previously stated, it is expedient that we proceed farther than this. Let it, then, be observed, that the New Testament itself, notwithstanding its pre-eminently spiritual character, and its almost exclusive attention to the realities of eternity, and to the moral state of man as connected with those realities, yet lays down principles on which alone we might safely rest our defence of Mechanics' Institutes, and from which might be easily deduced the obligation of Christians to support them. For example—it places before its votaries a Being as the object of their love and imitation, one of whose moral glories is a wisdom that brought into existence nature's wondrous frame, and gave those laws on which that frame depends—adapted the immensely diversified parts of the vast machine, and so combined them as to constitute a magnificent whole, exciting the wonder and admiration even of atheism itself—formed the various orders of organized beings, vegetable and animal—established their various physical and moral relations—and said to each, 'Thus far shalt thou go, but no farther.' A Being, to whose praise it is said, 'He doeth great things, past finding out, and wonders without number—He is light, and in him is no darkness at all'—and in reference to whom it is commanded, 'Be perfect as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.' Now, if admiration have any other object than the excitement of those pleasurable feelings connected with it, it must be, as it doubtless is, to rouse us to transcribe that which is seen to be so admirable, so far as our powers and opportunities extend: and then the wisdom, as well as the beneficence of God, is a legitimate object of human imitation. But in addition to this, the command to imitate an absolutely perfect Being must refer, not to one only, but to all his perfections, so far as they are imitable by dependent creatures; and then the field of universal knowledge is placed by Christianity before the mind of man, and he is required, so far as practicable, to traverse the whole.

"This is equally true respecting the commands, 'Add to your faith virtue, and to virtue knowledge.—Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report: if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things.' But I hasten to remark, that the passages, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself,' and 'As ye have opportunity do good to all men,' embody Christian precepts, the more valuable, because they are general. They are easily remembered, and without difficulty applied; they stand in the place of volumes of particular directions, embracing all that the most enlarged benevolence, under the direction of the most perfect wisdom, can devise; investing the whole with the authority of that Being who searches the hearts and tries the reins, and who will render to every man according as his works have been; and enforcing it by the glorious and awful realities of future retribution. That Mechanics' Institutes come within the sphere of these precepts, is easily seen. Their objects are thus well expressed in the two first resolutions of your late public meeting.

"That this meeting is deeply impressed with the necessity of providing the mechanics and others in this borough and neighbourhood with the means of acquiring solid and useful instruction in the various branches of art, science, and literature, more particularly such as are connected with the staple manufactures of the town.

"That an Institute be now formed, consisting of honorary members, subscribers, and

apprentices, in which, by systematic courses of lectures, by a collection of philosophical apparatus, and by the formation of classes, rational occupation and amusement will be provided for the members during their leisure hours, their advancement in scientific knowledge and skill greatly facilitated, and the happiest influence be exerted on their moral and intellectual habits.'

"The objects of this Institute, therefore, are in reality these. First, to qualify for increased usefulness in society, by increasing the stores of practical knowledge. Secondly, to furnish additional sources of pleasure to the mind, by new and enlarged views of truth. Thirdly, to abstract from sensual and vicious pursuits, by intellectual exercises and pleasures.—Now, can any one, after deliberate and dispassionate consideration, really doubt whether the objects thus proposed are good? Or whether the prescribed means are adapted to the attainment of them? We ask, in the first place, Is it not good to communicate happiness? Is it not true, that the desire of happiness is the universal law of conscious beings, whether rational or irrational, young or old, rich or poor; and that, towards the object in the attainment of which they believe happiness to consist, they as naturally, if not as necessarily, press, as matter towards its centre of gravity? And is it not true, that the human mind is so constituted as to derive pleasure from the perception of truth, just as the bodily senses derive pleasure from correspondent objects—as the eye from beauty, the ear from melody, the touch from softness, the taste from sweetness, and the smell from fragrance? Must it not, therefore, follow, that in proportion as the pleasures of the mind are either concealed, or removed, or rendered difficult of attainment, men will be impelled by a universal law of their nature to those gratifications which they can share only in common with the brutes? Is it not, therefore, good to place before them the ample stores which knowledge furnishes, to remove every difficulty, and to form them to correct habits of thought and reflection, in order that they may learn to value their dignity as rational creatures, and to relish the additional pleasures adapted by an infinitely wise and beneficent Being to their intellectual nature? We ask, in the second place, Is it good, or is it not, to detach our youthful, or, if we can, our adult population, from inordinate sensual gratifications, and from brutal and brutalizing pleasures, by directing them to higher and purer sources of enjoyment? And is not this a likely, and will it not, in many instances, by elevating their character and views, prove an efficient, means of lessening their relish for the grovelling pleasures of sense, or even of fitting them for the still higher pleasures of religion? Is this, then, a good, or is it not? We ask, thirdly, Is it not good to qualify men for increased usefulness in society? And will not this end be attained by acquainting them with the principles of the art in which they either are, or are to be employed—and with the constitution of the material on which they operate—or of the society of which they form a part—or of their own bodies and minds—or of the physical and moral relations which the God of nature and providence has established? *Will they not thus become better acquainted with the nature and reasons of their duties?* Will they not learn more beneficially to exert their own energies, as well as more wisely to direct, and more effectually to aid, their fellows? If this be not good, by what criterion is good to be distinguished? And if it be not an important good, by what rule is the value of a benefit to be estimated? Where is the virtuous man who would not wish to secure all this for himself, did he find it easy to do so? Or where is the Christian parent who would not wish to secure all this for his children? Indolence may oppose difficulties to this wish, but cannot extinguish it; impossibilities, real or imaginary,

may present themselves, but by every enlightened and benevolent parent it will be fondly cherished. An institution, then, directed to such objects, and calculated to secure them, comes fairly under the great Christian law of universal kindness; and is entitled to rank among those benevolent institutions of our country which Christianity sanctions by its authority, sustains by its influence, and irradiates with the smile of its approbation."

"The benefits we propose to confer, will, we are told, in some instances, be misapplied. And so has every kind of knowledge, in every age of the world. The knowledge of theology has often been conjoined with the basest hypocrisy—the knowledge of the law with the lowest chicanery—and of anatomy and medicine with the most atrocious criminalities. Every institution intended to benefit either the bodies or minds of men, is sure, in the present state of morals, to be partially abused;—and the man who resolved not to benefit his fellows, until he is certain that what he bestows will be properly appropriated, will live and die useless and despised. The God of nature and providence communicates blessings, though frequently abused—is kind to the vicious and ungrateful—and were he to shroud the heavens in darkness, and to curse the earth with barrenness, till every partaker of his bounty properly applied them, eternal night and universal sterility would be the characteristics of our world.

"But be it so, that intellectual acquirements will, in some instance, be abused; yet these instances will be comparatively few; and, considered in contrast with counterbalancing advantages, scarcely do they deserve a moment's thought. To some of these advantages we have already incidentally adverted. I must, however, take the liberty of laying before you the following statements, made at the anniversary of the Deptford Mechanic's Institution, by Dr. OLINTHUS GREGORY; a man whose veracity will not be doubted, nor his zeal for the order and welfare of his country questioned, by any who understand his principles and character. In the lecture, Dr. Gregory adduced various instances as having occurred within his own knowledge, in which extensive usefulness had been the result of mental improvement. 'He described the case of a *labourer on the turnpike road*, who had become an able Greek scholar;—of a *fifer* and a *private soldier* in a regiment of militia, both self-taught mathematicians, one of whom became a successful schoolmaster, the other a lecturer on natural philosophy;—of a journeyman *tin-plate worker*, who invented rules for the solution of cubic equations;—of a *country sexton*, who became a teacher of music, and who, from his love of the study of music, was transformed from a drunken sot to an exemplary husband and father;—of a *labourer in a coal mine*, a correspondent of the Doctor's, who writes ably on topics of the higher mathematics;—of another correspondent, a *labouring white-smith*, who is also well acquainted with the course of pure mathematics, as taught at Cambridge, Dublin, and the Military Colleges;—of a *tailor*, who was an exquisite geometrician, and discovered curves which had escaped the sagacity of Newton; with whom Hutton, Horsley, Maskerlyne, and Mascres delighted to converse on mathematical subjects, and who laboured industriously and contentedly at his trade till nearly sixty years of age, when, at the recommendation of his scientific friends, he was first appointed Master of Neal's Navigation School, and afterwards Nautical Examiner at the Trinity House;—of a *ploughman*, in Lincolnshire, who, without aid of men or books, discovered the rotation of the earth, the principles of spherical astronomy, and invented a planetary system akin to the Tychonic;—and of a *country shoemaker*, who has become distinguished as one of the ablest metaphysical writers in Britain; who has uniformly conducted himself so as to secure the esteem of all who know him; and who, at more than fifty years of age, has been removed, by the influence of his

talents and his worth, from his native county to London, where he now edits some useful publications devoted to the diffusion of knowledge, and the best interests of mankind.' On these facts, Dr. Gregory made the following observations:—"All these individuals were of exemplary conduct; and none of them evidenced discontent, or were unduly anxious to thrust themselves out of the situation in which they moved, until the way was opened for them by their own celebrity. What advantages might not these individuals have derived, had such societies as Mechanics' Institutes existed in their respective districts? And how much depression, doubt, difficulty, and loss of time might they not have saved?"

RIGHTS OF DISSENTERS.

I. The Dissenters claim the right of celebrating marriages by their own regular ministers.

II. They claim the right to have the registration of the births and marriages kept by those ministers made legal evidence.

III. They claim the right to have their places of worship exempt from the liability to poor rates, not as a matter of favour, but as a matter of law.

IV. They claim to be relieved from all rates whatever levied by parochial assessment, for the maintenance of parish and other churches, or the support of the worship and service carried on within their walls: and

V. The Dissenters claim the right to have their dead decently interred in an open and honourable manner in the church-yard, without having the attendance of parish ministers forced upon them.

CORRECT LEGISLATION.

At a late Temperance meeting in Boston, Dr. Edwards related the story of a chief of a distant nation, on the opposite side of the globe (the Sandwich Islands.) Foreigners, Europeans and Americans, came to him, as usual, for licenses to sell rum, not to the natives, for that was prohibited, but to their own countrymen. He answered, "No! To horses, cattle, and hogs, you may sell rum: but to *real* MEN you shall not, on these shores!"

HOW TO BE SAFE.

"Doctor," said Esq.—, about five years ago, after reading over the prescription of a distinguished friend of temperance, whom ill health had obliged to consult—"Doctor, do you think that a little spirits, now and then, will hurt me very much?"—"Why, no Sir," answered the Doctor, very deliberately; "I do not know that a *little—now and then—*would hurt you *very much*; but, Sir, if you don't take *any*, it won't hurt you *AT ALL*."

"WE DO NOT SELL TO DRUNKARDS."

What an excuse for selling the drunkard's drink! Why, it is selling to *temperate* men that does all the mischief. If you would sell none but to drunkards only, the evil would be comparatively nothing. No more drunkards would be made; your present customers would soon be stripped of their property and laid in the grave, and there would be no more drunkenness in the land. Yes; in ten years, the greater part of them would be dead. In twenty years, but a very few would be left; and in thirty, a drunkard could scarcely be found by diligent search! But this selling to *temperate* men, continued, will certainly lead many of them to become drunkards, and thus perpetuate the evil to all generations. We know that, if you sell to drunkards, they will go home and abuse their families, and perhaps kill some

of their members; but it is better, far better, that 300,000 families shall be neglected, abused, and murdered, and to have the evil stop there, than that millions, to the end of the world, should be made negligent, abusive, and murderous. We say, therefore, with the greatest seriousness, and full conviction of its truth, should you change your sale, and sell to *none but drunkards*, the evil would be less.

EARLY RISING AND MORNING AIR.

There is something in the morning air that, while it defies the penetration of our proud and shallow philosophy, adds brightness to the blood, freshness to life, and vigour to the whole frame. The freshness of the lip, by the way, is, according to Dr. Marshall Hall, one of the surest marks of health. If you would be well, therefore, if you would have your heart dancing gladly like the April breeze, and your blood flowing like an April brook, up with the merry lark, as Shakspear calls it, which is the ploughman's clock, to warn him of the dawn; up and breakfast on the morning air, fresh with the odour of budding flowers, and all the fragrance of the maiden spring; up from your nerve-destroying down beds, and from the foul air pent within your close-drawn curtains, and with the sun, "walk o'er the dew of the far eastern hills." Whoever is found in bed after six o'clock from May day till Michaelmas, cannot, in any conscience, expect to be free from some ailment or other, dependant upon relaxed nerves, stuffed lungs, disordered bile, or impaired digestion.

Indispensably necessary to a sound head and a settled stomach, a clear conscience and a good appetite, is early rising at the approaching season of the year. Reanimated nature is divesting herself of her winter attire, her hoar and frosty mantle, and springing forward glistening in her new and beauteous robes. Her opening graces, smiles, and blandishments are displayed expressly to win the admiration of those for whose pleasure and happiness, health and prosperity she was created. Is it not matter for reproachful expostulation to be found rolled up, sweating and steaming, between hot blankets, after six o'clock on a fine spring morning, with the bright sun laughing in our faces at our folly? Even should we be reconciled to the irreparable waste of time consequent upon such self-indulgence, to the hours which are thus thrown away, amounting to months and years, to the many advantages in business, trade, and study which are thus sacrificed, all of which is incompatible with a mind conscia recti; yet are we incited by every motive of pleasure influencing sensual existence to bestir ourselves with the lark, and taste the fresh air of the morning.

SELFISHNESS AND WANT OF CHARITY.

Were I to name the principal cause of the bad feeling, evil speaking, and all uncharitableness, which we show towards other persons, I should say, it was the not placing ourselves in their situation, and thus allowing for the circumstances in which they are placed. We must learn to exchange, in imagination at least, our situations with them, in order to judge of the motives by which they are operated, the reasons by which they are guided, and the temptations by which they are beset. Where our own interests conflict with theirs, we think too much of ourselves, too little of them. We look to our own wants, and if our neighbours do not sufficiently comply with our inclinations, we wonder at their inattention, We are indignant at the selfishness which they seem to display—while all the time, perhaps we are the more selfish of the two—we are thinking almost altogether of *ourselves*, and very little of *them*.

The old are surprised by the frivolity of the young. The young are disgusted with the prudence of the old.

The rich man wonders at the coarseness of the poor. The poor are indignant at the excessive refinement and voluptuous habits of the rich.

The countryman laughs at the fashions, the visiting cards, the particular hours set apart for pleasure in the towns. The townsman laughs at the manners and regularity of a country life.

A man who is not in business in town bores without mercy the man who is engaged in active business: while the latter is enraged by the tedious visits of his more idle neighbour.

What is remarkable, is, that the same person sometimes exchanges situations in life, and yet forgetting the circumstances by which he was formerly surrounded, takes an entirely different view of the interests and duties of his former situation. Thus, while he lives a tenant, he thinks it very hard that his landlord does not make all the repairs which his caprice suggests. But as soon as he becomes a landlord, he forgets the interest of the tenant, and thinks it hard that the tenant asks for any repairs at all. A labourer expects a thousand sacrifices on the part of his employer, and when he becomes an employer, he expects every sacrifice on the part of the labourer.

It is too much the case with every vocation in life, with every exchange of situation, with every other variety of interest and duty which the many-coloured drama of life presents to us. We know very well our own situation. We know the remedies which would relieve us. But we know not sufficiently the situation of others. Or, at least, we do not give ourselves time to enter into their situation, to adopt their feelings, and to understand the reasons by which they are actuated.

The fact is, that this thing lies much nearer the foundation of morality itself than we would at first imagine. We must put ourselves into our neighbour's situation before we can see perfectly what are our relative duties, what he ought to do for us, and what we for him, how we ought to feel for him, and he for us. "Do unto others as you would they should do unto you," is almost the same maxim, expressed in another form, as the *impartial spectator* of Adam Smith, in his beautiful theory of the Moral Sense. We must learn to enter our neighbour's feelings before we can do justice to him. I recommend it to all who wish to be good men or good Christians.—*Richmond Compiler.*

HINTS TO FEMALES,

ON THE INJURIOUS EFFECTS OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

MY FAIR FRIENDS,

Permit me to draw your attention to many of the practices of intemperance with which the habits and influence of the female sex are intimately connected.

From our earliest infancy, through the prevalence of false opinions, we are subjected to the influence of ardent spirits. Nurses and mothers usually have recourse to them to remove flatulence and indigestion, which are occasioned in infancy by the exhibition of improper food or neglect of cleanliness. This is a most injurious practice, that no sensible woman will be guilty of. Give the infant the food which nature so liberally prepares, and indigestion will seldom occur. When the child is cross from wind in the bowels, give a little magnesia and aniseed tea, or send for a doctor, and do not poison it with gin. Infants that are drugged with gin are always puny, and ten times more cross than those which are treated in a more prudent manner.

Never give gin to destroy worms. The symptoms which are thought to indicate the

presence of worms are often but the marks of the mother's indulgence. Avoid giving your children indigestible food and sweetmeats, and you will seldom see them troubled with worms, or the symptoms which you think arise from worms. And be sure you always keep the skin clean, for no child can be healthy while the pores of the skin are closed with dirt.

Never, by any means, give spirits to bring out the measles or small pox. In attempting to strike these out, the children are generally struck with death.

Never take spirits to remove depression of mind. They will only aggravate the evil.

Never drink brandy and water to help digestion, unless the doctor order you to do so.

Beware of this practice: it often leads to drunkenness.

Never attempt to cure a cold by giving rum or warm ale. By this means many valuable lives are yearly sacrificed. Colds often occasion inflammations, and then spirits add fuel to the fire, and the unfortunate person is sacrificed.

Never take intoxicating fluids to keep out the cold: you will be much colder when the effect of them ceases.

Never take gin or brandy for a pain in the bowels. This pain is frequently produced by inflammation, and then your remedy will occasion death. For the cure of colic, a glass of strong peppermint water and a dose of castor oil are worth all the brandy in the world; and, besides, they never can do harm.

Never take yourselves, nor give your husbands and friends, spirits or ale to make them sleep soundly. The habit is soon established; and, besides, are you wiser than the God of nature, who designed sleep as a natural repose, and not an artificial stupor? Think you, that any one can sleep comfortably in a fever? Yet you produce a fever by taking or giving spirits or ale.

Never take spirits to help you in your confinement. The inhabitants of uncivilized countries never take spirits on such occasions, and they suffer much less than English women; besides, it is a most dangerous practice. Never take spirits or ale after your confinement, without medical advice. They will generally retard your recovery, perhaps send you to the grave. Shun them, therefore, and resist the evil advice of mistaken friends.

Never take intoxicating liquors to help you to suckle your children. They do not assist in forming suck, but injure the quality of the milk. If at any time it behoves you to use good, nutritious food, it is while you are nursing. Many a child is poisoned by its mother's milk being impregnated with spirits or hops. On such occasions, milk is your best beverage.

If you are wise, you will never take either ardent spirits or ale without the advice of a medical man. You would not like to take opium without his advice, and yet opium is less dangerous to your bodily health, moral integrity, and domestic happiness. They are all useful as medicines, but very improper for persons in health. Even ale and porter contain little nourishment. There is more food in a pound of barley than in a gallon of ale.

But, besides taking intoxicating fluids for promoting health, females frequently give and take them for other purposes. When the infant is born, the doctor and neighbours must have some rum, either in their tea or raw, to drink to the happy recovery of the wife and welcome to the child. This evil custom is not observed among the rich, and it would be well if it were banished from the houses of the farmer and of the poor. Much noise is generally occasioned in the house by this practice, which distresses the patient, and exposes her to much neglect.

At christenings and churchings much intemperance is often witnessed, and females degrade themselves by encouraging this practice. If mothers really believe that in baptism they dedicate their children to God, why should they deem it necessary at the same time to make an offering to the devil?

Marriage is a solemn institution, at which females engage in new and important relationships with society; and yet it is often desecrated with irrational revelry. Cheerful enjoyment is at all times allowable, and particularly on such an occasion; but surely drunkenness can never be considered by reasonable beings as requisite to happiness.

Many females are induced to go to public houses by young men. This is highly detrimental to their true interests. If the men who take them there are sincere in their addresses, females, by going into such houses, give a sanction to them, which may afford their husbands an excuse for visiting them afterwards alone. Intemperance is the greatest bane of domestic happiness, and women should therefore avoid giving the slightest countenance to it. If the men who take them there are not sincere in their attentions, women who go to taverns expose themselves to almost certain ruin. Let every woman, then, tell the man who would lead her to a public house, that she will avoid such places as she would the house of destruction.

Funerals, which ought to beget solemnity of mind, are often seasons of excess. And women are often the principal actors on these occasions. You meet the attendants at the door with hot ale, and during their stay you are incessantly serving it round. Many, by your services in this way, are seen drunk as they follow the corpse to the grave, and finish the day, on so solemn an occasion, with riot and disorder. Never again lend your assistance as auxiliaries of drunkenness, but discountenance funeral drinking to the utmost of your power.

Many a female has had to lament that ever she went into a jerry shop. They are dens of vice and sinks of pollution.

How many young females (especially those connected with factories) do we see go into the dram shops! On a Saturday night, hundreds, it is believed, in this town, call, after they have received their wags, to get a dram. At the first commencement of their career, they will often prevail upon some older drunkard to fetch the spirit for them to the door, at night; but they soon become hardened, and fearlessly and openly buy their fearful draughts. Let such remember, that they are making a dreadful compact with the devil, and are hastening on to death and hell. Besides, all have children, parents, friends, or neighbours, who might be made happy with the money that is thus sinfully spent; and if not, ought young females not to provide for the expences of their after life, when circumstances will occur in which the money thus squandered would spare them many an hour of poverty and misery? Can a youth of sin be succeeded by a maturity of comfort, or an old age of serenity? As well might we expect a blasted tree to flourish. Early dissipation will entail a life of misery.

How often do married women, instead of keeping their houses clean and tidy, repairing the clothes of the family, and promoting the domestic comforts of their husbands and children, get together in an afternoon, and spend their money in social drinking. On these occasions, the tea is sometimes mixed with rum. This debasing practice, generally terminating in misery and ruin, you must always avoid.

Mistresses frequently give spirits and ale to their servants on washing days, or at other

times when they have to perform extraordinary work. This is an unreasonable and injurious practice. A servant should never be worked beyond her natural powers, and when fatigued, she ought not to be thrown into a fever with intoxicating fluids, but be allowed to recruit her strength with rest. Many a young female has been taught to relish liquors by the mistaken kindness of her mistress. The Temperance Societies have brought several distressing cases of this kind to light, that would otherwise probably have been buried in disregard. The Manchester Temperance Society has particularized two. One was of a washerwoman, who was taught to drink by a kind but inconsiderate lady. This lady had the painful lot to visit the victim when brought prematurely to the last stage of existence by the fatal indulgence she had taught her. The other was of a young woman, modest and amiable, who had a natural dislike to liquors, but being a great favourite with an indulgent mistress, she was forced, against her will, to take spirits on washing days, her mistress assuring her they would "do her good." She contrived to throw the spirits in the ashes, or give them to some other person, till her mistress found her out, and insisted upon her drinking them herself, even teaching her how to make them palatable. What occasioned disgust at first afterwards became relished, till the girl became a drunkard and a thief, was discharged from her place, and afterwards was confined to jail for being a disorderly person. Let mistresses think of these awful facts, and take heed that they do not inconsiderately lead their unsuspecting dependants into this cruel vice.

Drunkenness is the besetting sin of England; it is the curse of every family where it prevails; and females are especially interested in suppressing it. Let them beware, therefore, how they give countenance to so prevalent a vice, and unite, one and all, to discountenance the improper use of intoxicating liquors.

Temperance Societies have been formed, the design of which is to render persons better members of society; and who so deeply interested in their success as females? If domestic misery is occasioned by intemperance, the female must endure a large portion of it. If social happiness is fostered, who will reap so rich a harvest as the female? Are you not, then, called upon, in an especial manner, to unite yourselves with the friends of sobriety, to endeavour to check the vice of drunkenness? Many schemes have been devised to suppress intemperance; but so long as the orderly members of society gave a sanction to drunkenness by the use of intoxicating fluids, every plan proved of little avail. Temperance Societies design not only to withdraw this sanction, but to discountenance every practice that necessarily leads to intemperance. And whenever the most determined stand has been made against this fearful vice, the most happy results have followed. Practice ever is more operative than precept; but when both are combined, they generally prevail. Females are especially called upon to preserve this union on so important a subject, and the complaints of those who suffer from intemperance will be entitled to little regard if they encourage the practice by the improper use of intoxicating fluids. We call upon wives and daughters of the poor to join us, by the sufferings they endure, and the misery they witness. We call upon females in the middle rank of life, by their lonely evenings or widowed beds. We call upon those in the upper rank, by their wish to enjoy the rational and intellectual conversation of sober and cultivated men. We call upon every female, as she hates crime, as she dreads misery, as she would diminish disease, and as she would ensure a peaceful, happy home, to give up every unnecessary use of intoxicating liquors. And we trust there are few hearts that will not respond to our call.

A FRIEND.

THE FATE OF EDGAR; OR, THE CURSE OF DRUNKENNESS.

A TALE.

BY JAMES WOOD, N. G. OF THE PRINCE OF PEACE LODGE, DISLEY.

(From the Oddfellow's Magazine.)

Young Edgar was a father's only child,
 But dissipated, thoughtless, loose, and wild;
 His tender years betray'd a will inclin'd
 To vitiate rather than improve the mind;
 His father dying, left him an estate,
 Enough to make him happy, rich and great,
 Had he sought virtue; but to other ends,
 His time, his talents, and his purse he lends:
 From earliest youth he styl'd the flowing bowl,
 The first enjoyment of th' immortal soul!
 His views thus wretched, grovelling, low, and mean,
 Could look no higher than this earthly scene:
 But such his thoughts, and such his actions were,
 With wine he strove to banish every care;
 The pert, the vain, the giddy, and the gay,
 Were his continual guests from day to day;
 His house was ever open to their call,
 They flatter'd, and he entertain'd them all;
 Nought dragg'd old time so jocundly along,
 As midnight revelling, the drunkard's song,
 The glee, the dance, the Bacchanalian roar,
 With all the sweets of fancy'd pleasure's store:
 But still the chief enjoyment of his soul,
 Lay in the goblet or the sparkling bowl;
 From this curs'd vice he never would refrain,
 Though every other follow'd in its train;
 Bedeck'd with every ornament of taste,
 His table groan'd beneath a wanton waste.
 When years had thus unheeded pass'd away,
 His houses, tenantless, fell to decay,
 His lands all mortgag'd, all his wealth run through,
 Debt, upon debt unpaid,—a steward who
 To fill his master's purse no wish had shown;
 His only care was how to fill his own:
 There lawyers, doctors, servant men and maids,
 With all the craft of fancy's various trades,
 Some pillaging by law, and some by stealth,
 A host of leeches feeding on his wealth;
 How chang'd the scene from what it was before,
 A horde of duns by turns assail his door;
 Worn out by disappointments, now grown bold,
 His house, his lands, his all, they seiz'd and sold;

Compell'd by force to leave his once gay home,
 A hapless wanderer o'er the world to roam;
 Ah! where are now the pleasure-seeking throng,
 Who vow'd eternal friendship all along,
 Who while they drain'd his purse, admir'd his lot?
 They stand aloof, for now they know him not:
 Such, and so fleeting, are the friendships found
 In drunkards' cups, when wit and mirth go round;
 Of all his boasted friends not one is left;
 Of every earthly hope at once bereft,
 He with keen anguish mourn'd his hopeless fate,
 And tears of sorrow shed, but now too late.
 To heaven's high King he supplication made,
 To ask forgiveness and to ask for aid;
 He heaven's direction sought, nor sought in vain,
 His talents soon an ample living gain;
 He banker's clerk commenc'd, his income great,
 Though far below his former pompous state,
 It made the sweets of life by no means scant,
 And plac'd him much above the reach of want.
 He now resolv'd to change his mode of life,
 And took with prudent choice a lovely wife,
 Both fair and frugal, virtuous and kind,
 And nought surpass'd the beauties of her mind;
 His joys or sorrows gladly she would share,
 She eas'd his heart of more than half its care;
 While thus he liv'd he peace of mind possess'd,
 The bliss of blessing, and of being blest;
 A few fast fleeting months had thus roll'd on,
 By far the happiest he had ever known:
 But soon, too soon, these days of bliss were o'er,
 He fell, alas! where once he fell before.
 When smiling fortune blest him with the means,
 He long'd to revel in his former scenes;
 His uncheck'd inclinations took the sway
 He fell again to drunkenness a prey;
 The tavern now he frequently attends,
 And what should make him happy madly spends:
 The more he drinks, the more he wants, and now
 'Twas all he did, and all he wish'd to do.
 Thus day to day, and night to night succeeds;
 In vain his horror-stricken conscience pleads;
 With awful haste he runs his sinful race,
 Till want and ruin stare him in the face.
 His wife, poor woman! Oh! how hard her lot!
 Neglected, injur'd, wretched, and forgot;

Such complicated ills who could endure ?
 Her prospects blasted, and her ruin sure,
 To life-consuming care a constant prey,
 A victim to unkindness, day by day,
 Forc'd from the sweets of life at once to part,
 A deadly sorrow rankling in her heart,
 Despair was now her constant bosom guest,
 And grief, and anguish, settled in her breast.
 Yet still she loves her Edgar, still she tries
 To wean him from the bane of all his joys,
 With all the soft persuasion of her tongue,
 On which he had oftentimes enraptur'd hung,
 With all love could suggest, or art devise,
 She strove to make him happy, good, and wise,
 To win his heart, his lost love to regain,
 All, all was urg'd, but all was urg'd in vain !
 She begg'd, entreated, knelt and pray'd, and cried,
 She gave her life, and, broken-hearted, died !
 He, poor, unhappy wretch, discharg'd, disgrac'd,
 Again abandon'd to the world's wide waste,
 No house, no home, no place to rest his head,
 Oblig'd to labour for his daily bread,
 The lowest drudgery of life to do,
 And earn his victuals by a sweating brow.
 Though thus reduc'd, he still had happy been,
 Had not the vice of drinking chang'd the scene ;
 He still indulg'd the health-destroying cup,
 Till he nor could, nor wish'd, to give it up ;
 'Tis hard a habit thus confirm'd to mend,
 Though certain ruin is its certain end.
 The sober and industrious he shuns,
 To waste his hard-earn'd pittance nighly runs ;
 The common brothel now his chief delight,
 The produce of each day he spends at night ;
 Thus eagerly he press'd the downward road,
 Till worn-out nature sunk beneath her load :
 Diseases'd, emaciated, pale, and wan,
 Though scarce attain'd the middle age of man ;
 His constitution broke, his vigour dead,
 His brain bewilder'd, and his reason fled ;
 Too weak to work ; no home, no hope, no friend ;
 His mis-spent life fast drawing to an end ;
 How vast the change ! his golden dreams are o'er ;
 Oh ! how unlike the Edgar known before !
 One night (it was the last he liv'd on earth)

He curs'd the day and hour that gave him birth :
 From mingling with the drunken midnight rout,
 Arm'd with a murderous blade, he sallied out,
 On self-destruction fully, firmly bent ;
 He knew not, nor he car'd not, where he went ;
 At length he reach'd a valley, deep and long,
 And craggy mountains either side o'erhung,
 Here dreary night for ever seem'd to sit,
 A place for deeds of death and darkness fit ;
 'Twas here he paus'd—his useless life retrac'd—
 A barren, wild, uncultivated waste—
 Great God ! he cried, let my example be
 A warning unto all that follow me :
 My God, my heaven, my all ! too long forgot ;
 I ask not mercy—I deserve it not !
 Let fiends and furies my companions be,
 Yea, fix with these my endless destiny ;
 If there's a pang I never yet have known,
 On my devoted head now send it down !
 Oh ! Heaven ! avenge her death—my wife, my wife !
 'Twas my unkindness robb'd her of her life.
 What ghastly shades now swim before my sight !
 The scenes of horror and of endless night ;
 Assist, ye fiends, and bid my arm succeed,
 Nor heaven, nor earth, nor hell, shall stay the deed !
 I send my wasted body to the tomb,
 And seal, my soul, thy everlasting doom !
 Then, with an idiot's wild and frenzied start,
 He plung'd the fatal dagger in his heart !
 Thus Edgar liv'd, thus died by his own hand,
 The victim of a vice that shames our land.
 Ye youths of Britain, shun this hell-born curse ;
 It leads from good to bad, from bad to worse ;
 'Tis the most powerful weapon Satan tries,
 And all that's great and good before it flies :
 If life you value, shun, for ever shun,
 This sin by which such numbers are undone.
 Nought tends so much th' infernal host to swell ;
 It slays its thousands, and half peoples hell !
 Fly this detested vice, if you would save
 Your soul from death, your body from the grave :
 Oft as this dread temptation is applied,
 Oh ! think how Edgar liv'd—how Edgar died !